

**Remarks**

Upon entry of the present amendment, new claims 52-65 will be pending. Previously pending claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 19-26, 43-51 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. Applicants reserve the right to file continuing applications to pursue said canceled subject matter. New claims 52-65 find ample support throughout the originally filed specification, for example, at page 3, lines 25-33; page 6, lines 31-33; page 7, lines 3-5; page 20, Table 6; and page 21, lines 20-24 of the original specification. Thus Applicants respectfully submit no new matter has been added and respectfully request entry and consideration of said new claims.

On page 3 of the Office Action, all the pending claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 19-26 and 43-51 have been rejected because of an alleged failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, written description. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse for the reasons previously given on the record (see Applicants' Response filed April 15, 2008). Nevertheless, Applicants note that claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 19-26 and 43-51 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer or in acquiescence of the rejections herein, thereby rendering the present rejection moot with respect to those claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 52-65 also fully comply with the written description requirements as new claims 52-65 clearly find full support in the original specification as filed, for example, at page 3, lines 25-33; page 6, lines 31-33; page 7, lines 3-5; page 20, Table 6; and page 21, lines 20-24 of the original specification. Therefore, one of skill in the art would immediately envision that Applicants had possession of the claimed invention based upon the written description of the specification and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection.

On page 9 of the Office Action, all the pending claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 19-26 and 43-51 have been rejected because of an alleged failure to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, enablement. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse essentially for the same reasons already made of record (see Applicants' Response filed April 15, 2008).

Nevertheless, Applicants note that claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 19-26 and 43-51 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer or in acquiescence of the rejections herein, thereby rendering the present rejection moot with respect to those claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 52-65 also fully comply with the enablement requirements. The specification clearly teaches which residues may be substituted to produce a modified IgG with increased heat resistance and stability, as claimed. Coupled with the specification's teachings of how one of skill can substitute such amino acids (see, for example, section 5.3.1 of the present specification) as well as how one can test for improved stability (see, for example, section 5.2 of the present specification), one of skill in the art is not left to "guess" at which modifications need to be made in order to achieve improved resistance to heat degradation. Since the present specification fully enables the invention as now claimed, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**Conclusion**

Applicants believe that the present claims meet all of the requirements for patentability. Entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments and remarks are respectfully requested. If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, the undersigned invites the Patent Office to phone her at the number provided below. If any additional fees, beyond those directed for payment are necessary, please charge any required fee to Deposit Account No. 500479.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 3, 2009

  
Janet M. Martineau (Reg No. 46,903)  
Attorney for Applicants

MedImmune LLC  
One MedImmune Way  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878  
(301) 398-4532 direct dial  
(301) 398-9532 fax